

$\Delta$   
301.153  
C641i  
c.2

# University of Florida Libraries



The Gift of  
Presidents Office  
COLLEGE LIBRARY





# INTERGROUP RELATIONS CENTERS

---

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2011 with funding from  
LYRASIS Members and Sloan Foundation



# INTERGROUP RELATIONS CENTERS

*By Everett R. Clinchy*



PUBLISHED BY  
FARRAR, STRAUS AND COMPANY • NEW YORK  
FOR THE LOUIS J. AND MARY E.  
HOROWITZ FOUNDATION, INC. • 1949

*Copyright 1949 by Everett R. Clinchy*

*All rights reserved, including the right  
to reproduce this book, or portions  
thereof, in any form.*

*If*

*Designed by Stefan Salter*

*Manufactured in the U.S.A. by H. Wolff, New York*



## CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Preface   | vii |
| I. The Promise of Social Science  | 1   |
| II. Medical Science Shows a Way   | 7   |
| III. Research in the Center   | 14  |
| IV. A Training Center   | 21  |
| V. The Center as a Community Clinic                                       | 27  |
| VI. Intergroup Relations in Industry                                      | 36  |
| VII. Research Needs in Intergroup Relations                               | 43  |
| VIII. The University, the Investor and the<br>Intergroup Relations Center | 51  |

TO

LOUIS CAPLAN,

*friend of the advancement of learning  
in the field of intergroup relations*

## PREFACE

---

JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES once observed that in the nineteenth century mankind seemed to have been on the threshold of an age of reason and enlightenment. The promise of a good life for the individuals of all groups appeared to be within society's reach. Then the fanatical tyrannies and catastrophic conflicts of the twentieth century raised doubts in the minds of many as to whether man would ever prove to be a reasonable being capable of enlightened use of the tools and techniques his civilization had produced.

The thesis of these pages is that by adequate development of the social sciences, education and philosophy, the *genus homo* can make the necessary cultural changes that will help us to use constructively the great advances in the physical sciences, and to live together creatively in a dynamic peace. To do this will require as earnest, bold and vast applications of social studies to man, to his cultures and to his intergroup relations, as the physical sciences have applied to research into matter.

Society's chief problem in our time, according to Raymond B. Fosdick, is "learning and proving that cultural differences are compatible with peace." The religious wars

## *Preface*

between Catholics and Protestants were the products of an age that did not believe this. Hatred and contempt of Jews have marred Christian history for nineteen centuries. But social scientists have carefully accumulated evidence to prove that ailments of this nature can be cured. They have advised statesmen of all nations that the freedom and welfare of one group are ultimately bound up with the freedom and welfare of all; that the world need not continue to be a place where men must either kill or be killed. Effort on behalf of one's own group can become compatible with effort on behalf of humanity. Anti-Semitism, and all animosities and persecutions like it, can be outmoded through science and education.

Scientific findings justify this faith in humanity. Contemporary social scientists confirm the confidence expressed by religious leaders in the human potentiality for the brotherhood of man.

To do the job in the social sciences that the times demand, this book proposes that intergroup relations centers be established, just as individuals and foundations organize and support efforts to conquer disease in modern medical centers. The large universities lend themselves best to the co-ordinated activity of the social sciences, mental hygiene, education, religion, social work, and all of the disciplines and programing related to the problems which must be faced. The idea, however, can be adapted to the limitations of any college, public school, church or industrial plant. Every town and city should start with what it has, and in its own way make its own approach to the humanizing of group relations.

## Preface

The book grew out of conversations among social scientists and educators which the noted sociologist Donald R. Young and the writer arranged at Princeton. While Dr. Young, and others mentioned in the text, contributed suggestions, they should not be held accountable for the manner in which the thoughts are expressed or the conclusions drawn. Mrs. Irene Lyons Murphy, the author's secretary, is to be thanked for her services in the preparation of the manuscript.

I feel especially indebted to Dr. Samuel H. Flowerman, Prof. Charles E. Hendry, Prof. Alexander Leighton, Prof. Robin Williams, and Dr. Howard E. Wilson.

The Louis J. and Mary E. Horowitz Foundation Inc., made possible the studies involved in this work and its publication. The Trustees to whom credit should go are:

Louis J. Horowitz, *Chairman*

Louis Caplan, *President*

Courtland Kelsey, *Vice-President*

George R. Schmidt, *Secretary and Treasurer*

Hamilton C. Rickaby, *Assistant Treasurer*

Louis W. Abrons

Solomon B. Freehof

Bernard F. Gimbel

Morris S. Lazon

John L. Loeb

Basil O'Connor

James N. Rosenberg

The author is grateful to Dr. Martin P. Chworowsky for reading the manuscript and making helpful suggestions.

## Preface

This colleague raised three interesting questions. 1. *Does the analogy of the medical center fit the intergroup relations center at every point?* The answer is no. 2. *Is it presumed that an intergroup relations center will manipulate culture groups as hospitals do patients, and push people around as the Manhattan Project did atoms?* Again the answer is no. 3. *What, then, is the value standard?* The book accepts the dignity and worth of each human personality as the prime concern, and would measure the worth of all cultures, and of all intergroup relations, by the query, *What do they do to people, and, by the grace of God, to individuals of every group?*

Throughout the text the reader should bear in mind that the writer is suggesting a multiple approach to the problems of current intergroup relations, and that no hard, fixed concept of any single *intergroup relations center* exists. Moreover, as many approaches are tried, the important factor is the cross-fertilization of ideas that occurs among workers, scientific fields, and varying types of organizations. A democratic philosophy should underlie all the steps taken, for the salvation of a world in which mass movements of dictatorship are sweeping like tides needs the insight, participation and struggle of the people, not only the elite among intellectuals.

Everett R. Clinchy

## I. THE PROMISE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

---

**A**TOMIC physicists these days are frequently called upon to explain the mysteries of their trade to an anxious public. Professor John R. Dunning, of Columbia University, likes to demonstrate a lesson in energy with a cube of uranium, a bit of metal the volume of a pair of dice. The one-inch cube, he explains, can be transformed into power that will light, heat and energize the city of New York for a day. Or, this metal can be packaged to help blow that city and its civilization to drifting dust. What will determine which way the dice will be thrown?

Physical scientists have been asking questions in every department of the material universe and have obtained answers which promise more and more amazing technological developments. The limits on man's physical reach that were present in the horse and buggy era have been removed. Exciting prospects for construction and ominous possibilities for destruction lie ahead.

Meanwhile, the students of man's intellectual and moral abilities have turned up some equally arresting information. "Human nature," which in the horse and buggy age was assumed to be incurably warlike, cruelly predatory, and sinfully acquisitive, appears to be innately not that at

all. The old notions about fixed and limited potentials in brain capacity, emotional development and co-operative abilities according to "race" have been proven inaccurate. Group prejudices and animosities are not fixed in nature, and society does not have to put up with them. Proof of human capabilities that are as stirring as anything the physical scientists have discovered about the material world are now being uncovered by the social scientists. The significance of these promising veins of exploration being mined by the social scientists is that cultural anthropology, together with psychology, sociology, biology, and research in economics and history, may soon contribute sufficient material to enable educators, philosophers and religious teachers to help determine which way the atomic dice will be cast. But this will be true only if the social sciences are given adequate encouragement and support.

Here, in brief, is what the scientists tell us about groups of men, their essential equality, and their potential strength:

Biologists and anthropologists have discovered that mankind is *not* divided into antipathetic races. People of all culture groups of all civilizations everywhere appear to have had a common origin. The *genus homo* is one human race or family. To be sure, by mutations, biological variations have developed in some features like hair texture, skin color, eyelid shape and shinbone design, but these have no inherent relation to mental ability. Now, with scientific knowledge and technological equipment, all people can be at home everywhere and work together any-



where. Science proves that cultural differences in knowledge, personality and customs are not transmitted biologically. Hostilities and methods of expressing animosities are not born in children, and therefore they can be controlled.

Anthropologists have exploded theories of racial purity and psychologists those of racial superiority. The students of man have tried to classify people according to physical traits. This has been a difficult and uncertain business. For one thing, in the many thousands of years all the tribes of human beings have wandered, crossed and intermarried, groups have mingled to such an extent that there is truly no such thing as a *pure* race strain. Again, no single characteristic, like height, weight, color of skin or texture of hair, classifies people, since so many variations will be found in each group. Furthermore, the anthropologists can find no evidence among Caucasoids, Mongoloids or Negroids that indicates any inherited racial hierarchy.

Cultural anthropologists know of no "chosen people" biologically or culturally. Scientifically speaking, different groups of human beings have invented and accustomed themselves to varying ways of life which scientists call cultures. The character of each culture depends on the experiences of people in relation to their physical surroundings, knowledge, beliefs, arts, customs, laws, institutions, and their co-mingling and borrowing from other cultures. The longest-lived cultures, as well as the most dynamic, rich, interesting, resourceful and prosperous economically, in-

tellectually and morally, have been those cultures most disposed to trade goods and ideas with other cultures.

Psychologists have amassed an enormous quantity of data which reveals that intelligence and personality are barometers of cultural weather rather than immutable, inherited characteristics. Every time that psychologists have attempted to measure intelligence they have ended up measuring the environmental experiences of their subjects. For example, in Army tests, Negroids from Ohio scored eight points higher than Caucasoids from Mississippi. This simply meant that, contrary to the prejudiced, prescientific view, the nature and availability of education, not skin color, are determining factors in intelligence level. Personality traits bearing on intergroup attitudes are shaped by kith and kin groups, they are not determined by genes.

Professor Otto Klineberg, of Columbia University, adds this: nothing science has contributed thus far would negate the assumption that under similar conditions individuals of all cultures would be distributed according to the same bell-shaped statistical curve of intelligence (assuming that a standard for intelligence for all cultures had been agreed upon). This means that all groups of people, given the same length of time in the same environment, i.e., shelter and diet, educational opportunities and moral nurture, would produce about the same number of people of "average" intelligence, the same few "geniuses" and "morons." Professor Julian H. Steward, a cultural anthropologist, also of Columbia, declares that there is sufficient scientific evidence to prove that all groups of men are created equal.

Inequalities of ability result, in other words, from inequalities of opportunity.

Educators say that attitudes of prejudice or understanding, hate or love, rejection or co-operation, are entirely the result of experiences of children after birth. *Learning*, the pedagogues have found, comes about as experiences and meanings are absorbed by a person. An individual makes a part of his soul or "self" the values he accepts, the information to which he pays attention, his relations with others and the personality traits to which that individual in that particular culture attaches importance. Shiftlessness, dishonesty, religious group prejudices, Jim Crow transportation customs or bad manners, are not born into anybody. They are the products of the way some people live. Educators have discovered "culture" as have the anthropologists. Historians reveal that cultures change and grow. Educators believe culture growth can be controlled. They say that human beings can *learn* any culture pattern that teachers can guide people to follow.

Religious teachers who are studying the inner springs and growth of the psyche are benefiting from scientific evidence which substantiates many of the ancient religious insights. We find agreement that "out of the heart are the issues of life"; that power for one's will and strength to act on noble decisions comes from faith, and is aided by religious disciplines. The sanctions of morality and the redeeming power of religion not only provide checks and balances for personal living, but research studies in this

field \* justify expectations of great gains in intergroup relations as science, philosophy and religion join forces in study and experimentation.

In sum, then, social scientists and educators are hopeful that they can catch up with the physical scientists. The latter need have no guilt complexes because their research has been used in the development of atomic and biological warfare. Nor need the physical technologists who produce the gadgets and machines feel responsible for launching a curse upon the world. Man has now reached the stage in history, as scientists advised UNESCO, where he can study scientifically the causes and management of tensions which make for intergroup trouble. By the use of the same scientific methods that gained answers to so many physical mysteries, answers to societal questions can be sought.\*\*

\* Statesman John Foster Dulles recently declared: "If I were managing a fund, I would try to use the money to find and encourage those who are doing fundamental thinking in the field of religion and philosophy, from whom can come, not at once but gradually, a rebirth of the faith needed if men are properly to use their knowledge."

\*\* Professor L. A. Radelet of Notre Dame University qualifies the hope in this way: 1. Social Science studies man in his human relationships, while physical science studies man as a specimen. 2. A physical science principle is a statement of cause and effect relationship that always holds good under the same given conditions. 3. Social science principles indicate strong *tendencies* only, for man does not always act as man.

## II. MEDICAL SCIENCE SHOWS A WAY

---

WHEN the people of America wanted to harness the power let loose in atomic fission, all of the boundaries between departments of physical studies were crossed. The Conants, Comptons, Oppenheimers and men and women in other specialized disciplines were made into a team. With money for manpower and laboratory equipment, the Manhattan Project became a science and engineering center for atomic energy.

When medical scientists wanted to meet community health problems, not only with hospitals and clinics, but with co-ordinated research and the best in training methods, they developed medical centers. Such streamlined units as the Columbia and Cornell Medical Centers in New York illustrate the total approach society is making toward the achievement of abundant health. Studies of anatomy, physiology and bacteriology are correlated with scientific analyses of every environmental factor that bears on keeping bodies alive and well. This includes studies ranging from hygienic heating of homes to socio-psychosomatic dealings with elements like family economic security, domestic felicity, body fatigue, nutrition and mental health. In medical centers scientists and physicians have an op-

portunity to launch a many-pronged attack on crippling and costly diseases. A medical center has laboratories whose discoveries are quickly made available in hospitals and clinics. Its medical schools offer young men and women excellent opportunities for study. And not only does the medical center instruct in the arts of research and practice, but helps to educate the general public in preventive medicine and hygiene.

Does not the teamwork that has emerged in scientific "Manhattan Projects" and medical centers suggest the use of the same approach to man's relations with man that has proved so successful in man's relation to matter and health? The time has come for the installation of intergroup relations centers on university campuses, to attend to intergroup health, as modern medical centers are designed to promote physical health. Given money for manpower, laboratory needs, and co-ordinated training programs, universities could make prodigious gains in the social sciences and in social practice. University intergroup relations centers would serve three primary functions. They would be (1) diagnostic and research institutes, (2) "hospitals" for "preventive" and "therapeutic" education in intergroup affairs, and (3) training centers for human relations "doctors" and "nurses" and intergroup technicians.

Social science is the science of the relationships of human beings, and the first function of the centers involves the continuous study of man and man's group life. Each center would assign positions on its team to all the social science departments and to members of the humanities departments, as well as to engineering, theology, business

and industrial faculties. The study of all current intergroup problems, from those in the home and neighborhood to the nation and the world, would be grist for the mill. Then, too, the local social case workers, industrial personnel managers, labor officials, schoolteachers, church and civic program builders, should be invited to present their intergroup relations problems as cases arise.

The second function of the center would be to treat chronic social ailments, like anti-Semitism, anti-Protestantism, anti-Mormonism, anti-Catholicism and all the other age-old antipathies which require treatment. Educational and social action measures which would be in the nature of preventive medicine would fall into this category. Extension courses for labor and management in plants, workshop seminars in adult education for church and synagogue leaders, as well as in-service case work with teachers, would be part of the plan. Program committees in women's clubs, service clubs, veterans' posts, youth agencies, lodges, fraternal orders and women's auxiliaries, libraries and other organizations are increasingly interested in this field of developing skills in intergroup relations. The center must also be ready to receive "ambulance cases," for accidents and emergencies will occur perennially in every multi-cultural society. No matter how good the machinery for good will and co-operation, international, inter-racial and inter-religious breakdowns are bound to happen in intergroup experience.

Training, the third function, would involve courses of study in human relations for undergraduates. Professionals in intergroup relations are needed on the graduate-study

level. The future will offer an increasing number of positions for people with doctorates and master's degrees in this field. Schools, churches and synagogues, stores, industrial plants, social work and civic agencies generally, as well as intergroup relations programs in particular, have need of men and women with human relations teaching skills. Faculty professors and co-ordinators of research and community relations will be in demand as centers of intergroup relations are launched.

Several leading universities, recognizing as their responsibility the notable lack of training opportunities in this field, have begun to meet the vast demand that has been created in recent years. Enlightened curriculum planners include human relations material in social science courses. The Harvard survey resulted in an orientation course which deals with intergroup relations. Miami University established the Bronston Chair of Human Relations, the first in this field, and has made the subject an elective major. Registrations were so heavy that an assistant was required by Professor Gordon Lovejoy, and the curriculum requirements of major students is making the formation of the intergroup relations center concept inevitable. Teachers College at Columbia University is now training men and women in intergroup skills on the doctorate level, and its program includes courses on the undergraduate level, an "internship" program for prospective intergroup experts and seminars for city schoolteachers. New York University's Education Department's work at Washington Square developed a program in conjunction with the Bureau of Intercultural Education. Western Reserve University, with



a record of distinguished social work training, decided to focus attention on culture groups in human relations and the University of Chicago has undertaken a similar project.

With Wayne University taking the lead, twenty colleges of education have been carrying out sociometric tests on the techniques of "teaching teachers" intergroup skills. Workshops for teachers have become popular summer-session seminars at North Carolina, Texas, Leland Stanford, Southern California, Rutgers and scores of other universities. Invariably, the seminars, courses, or workshops which start out with "problems" in intercultural education end up by calling on all the various social science departments for information and help. Thus the concept of the intergroup relations center has grown out of actual need and experience.

Rollins College has introduced courses interpreting Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism as sub-cultures in American civilization. Professors in the fields of sociology, economics, philosophy, religion, education, and the arts are bringing their disciplines to bear on the study of intergroup relations.

The Horowitz Foundation recently convened a number of social scientists \* to consider aspects of research and

\* Present at the conference, which was held at the Princeton Inn, Princeton, New Jersey, in December 1948 were: Mr. Stuart Chase, author of *The Proper Study of Mankind*; Dr. Samuel H. Flowerman, Research Director of the American Jewish Committee; Prof. Charles E. Hendry, of the School of Social Work, University of Toronto; Prof. Alexander Leighton, of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell; Prof. Robin Williams of Cornell University; Dr. Howard E. Wilson, an executive associate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; and Dr. Donald R. Young, General Director of the Russell Sage Foundation.

education in intergroup relations. The conference stressed the need for basic research in broad areas of the study of mankind, for training of personnel for such work, and for making the findings available for the use of communities everywhere. All of these objectives could be advanced by centers of intergroup relations.

Suppose, for example, that the early symptoms of the tension that finally erupted into inter-racial violence in Detroit in 1943 had been laid before an intergroup relations clinic for a systematic check-up in 1942. Signs of trouble were visible to the trained eye of an intergroup expert months, even years before. Actually, thoughtful laymen had also been aware of a growing, unreasonable animosity between different groups. Detroit's civic leaders had tried, with old-fashioned home remedies, to combat the unhealthy antagonism by the best means they knew, but they had failed. They needed more knowledge, more scientifically developed techniques, a greater awareness on the part of many leading citizens of both the problem, its causes and its solution. Teamwork among the best social science specialists, professors, technicians in the fields of social work, education and religion could have saved the community its period of bloody violence.

In any similar community situation an intergroup relations center would have many functions. It would provide a storehouse of research knowledge which could be drawn on for particular problems. Its experienced research specialists and technicians could diagnose a situation and determine the best therapy for it. It could then help the local civic or community agency to apply

this therapy. These three operating functions of a university intergroup relations center (*research, personnel training and clinical practice* in community, industry and school) will be discussed in turn. It should be pointed out that the following outline of what an intergroup relations center itself can accomplish in these three fields pertains also to the whole area of intergroup relations as well. Medical science did not wait on the erection of large, modern centers; individual doctors and scientists everywhere advanced the practice of medicine. Nor does a medical center interfere with other forms of research and practice. Rather, it is meant to aid all such efforts. Intergroup relations centers would assist all action and study in the social sciences. Individual school systems, colleges, industrial plants, theological schools and churches, do not have to wait for a neighboring university to begin a large center. They can start where they are by adapting the ideas that are outlined to improve intergroup relations in small-scale efforts. Indeed, precisely this type of development in the local chapters of the National Conference of Christians and Jews is evolving into the kind of integrated study and action this book discusses.

### III. RESEARCH IN THE CENTER

---

SOCIAL scientists look with envy at the extensive planning that goes on in physics and chemistry. They know that the answers to intergroup relations problems are not within the bounds of knowledge of one scientist or even the realm of one social science. All branches must cooperate, must exchange information, must even in some cases participate in a combined attack on particular problems in small-scale "Manhattan Projects." Such planning is possible in the intergroup relations center at many levels.

No discipline, or branch, in the social sciences can be left out of any phase of the intergroup relations center. Anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists, historians, economists and the political scientists, among others, will be called on for assistance. The director or co-ordinating staff is responsible for seeing that such co-operation proceeds smoothly and produces results.

Such intergroup relations planning should, first of all, bring together research efforts that, for one reason or another, now are wasted. Studies should be planned on the basis of the overall long-term needs in human relations. It is hoped that planning would not end within the center but would be integrated with current, broader objectives of

universities and foundations. The separate phases of an overall plan for research on a particular problem would be taken up in turn, dependent on the most urgent needs and on the information accumulated so far by research specialists. Gradually and systematically the purposes of basic research would be served.

Co-operation would not exist merely among the advanced scientists of the university, as is the case now. At the present time the research studies of many undergraduate and even graduate students frequently are misdirected efforts because of the lack of integrative planning in social science departments. In the intergroup relations center, a student would not only have the benefit of the co-ordinated supervision of many departments, but could make his master's essay or doctor's thesis an integral part of an overall research plan. Moreover, as President Ludd M. Spivey of Florida Southern College put it, the intergroup relations center idea can mesh every course of study and illuminate the whole with meaningful life experience.

Social scientists are often accused of insulating themselves against the practicalities of daily life. Many scientists do profitable work on their own; there is a role for the lone scientist. Many more are engaged in studies that do not at the moment bear any relation to everyday matters; there is justification for scientific research which does not yield immediate answers to pressing problems. But there are values also in teamwork, and in finding ways in which the students of society can give their teaching and research work more significance by relating them to community situations. For example, the faculty committee of a large

university traveled in a body to a small city, typical of the locales in which their pupils would one day work. They studied the atmosphere and problems of the city, its agencies, schools and neighborhoods. They came back with a much clearer and more realistic picture of their own roles as scientists, teachers and curriculum planners. One of the main purposes of the intergroup relations center is to foster on a continuous basis such reciprocal action between university and community. The specialists of the center have the whole community as a laboratory, as it were, for analysis and experimentation. These specialists serve the community with scientific techniques with which to smooth out intergroup problems. The community serves them with situations, hypotheses and opportunities for study and experimentation.

The medical men have a name for it. Basic research is done *in vitro*, that is, in the test tube, and applied *in vivo*, which means related in the life situation to a living being. In the realm of social science there is a similar distinction. Terms are used, cases discussed, involving basic research projects which appear as esoteric to the layman as higher mathematics. Foundations willingly support the bacteriologist whose highly specialized work makes social conversation about it impossible. They permit him to work quietly away without demanding a "sure cure" at the end of a stated period. Time and again such nearly blind faith in the physical sciences has paid off in practical scientific and technological achievements. Faith in basic research in

human relations is as badly needed. In fact, no important practical applications can be made in any area until a solid store of knowledge about human behavior is built up.

Similarly, foundations and individuals who wish to support the important efforts of the social scientists will always have to have a certain amount of courage in assigning funds for basic research *in vitro*. Although the human relations center can help to assure the immediate and proper use of basic research, sure-fire, spectacular results cannot be guaranteed for any basic research effort. But social scientists themselves are critical of present research methods. They are, and will continue to be, the first to point out ways and means of adding to basic research knowledge in such a manner that it has importance and meaning for everyday community and industrial life.

Research of a short-term or applied nature (a brief study on race relations in an Army unit during wartime, for example) can be carried on in such a way that it adds to the general store of theoretical knowledge. Personnel who have been trained to be mindful of the needs of basic research and who understand the bearing their work has on large social issues can gear their efforts and interpretations to the purposes and needs of more fundamental problems. An intergroup relations center offers excellent opportunities for this type of training and research.

Studies in progress and data now available offer additions to basic research. For example, social scientists worked under tremendous pressure on the problem of Army personnel selection, manpower organization and

team morale during the war.\* Obviously, all work had to be of a "short-term" nature. When the pressure relaxed, the scientists sifted the data for possible application to other areas. They found that some of the quick research had provided additions to the store of principles and rules for handling intergroup relations problems, although much, of course, had to be discarded. The conclusion was that an intelligent re-examination of many studies in various fields could add to the storehouse of theoretical knowledge that social scientists would like to see filled.

The intergroup relations center would bring to the fore another question which has become increasingly important to social scientists: the relation between academic research and the community. The university center would achieve a far closer and more continuous relationship between researcher and community leader than has existed in many quarters to date. A social scientist who combines intergroup with industrial relations experience may go into a plant to work side by side with personnel men in an effort to solve a teamwork problem. Another specialist will find himself actively working with a local school principal. What and how good the relations are between scientist and administrator will be an important question.

It is not, of course, the first time that this question has come up. During the war social scientists worked with Army and Navy officers and with many government agency officials. They found that "short-haired" adminis-

\* cf: *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* by S. A. Stouffer, E. A. Suchman, L. C. DeVinney, S. A. Star, R. M. Williams Jr. (Princeton University Press, 1949)



trators are frequently wary of "long-haired" Ph.D.'s. The local policy maker may be annoyed at theories and hypotheses, may not be willing to accept scientific solutions in lieu of the favored ones of the past. Social scientists who worked with wartime agencies have some definite advice to give on this situation.

They suggest that if a personal relationship based on mutual respect is firmly established between the specialist and the administrator, many problems will never arise. Once an official is certain that the scientist's aim is not to tell him how wrong he is, chances are good for a meeting of minds which will spell success.

The university center would satisfy a need that many intergroup experts have cited. A community race relations committee, with excellent intentions, plans a campaign for educating neighbors about the fallacy of racism and the need for co-operation across race, nationality and culture lines. What is to be the approach? A line of attack is chosen, but how can the committee be sure that the campaign will succeed? Any business executive or labor union leader knows that learning is rarely a purely intellectual process, that the perusal of educational literature must be accompanied by actual experience and emotional impact if it is to be convincing. Psychologists measuring attitudes before and after an educational campaign on racism have reached the same conclusion. Yet much missionary work by intergroup committees relies heavily on the "intellectual approach."

Students of human behavior have amassed considerable information about anti-prejudice programs. To bring this

knowledge to the attention of community workers, schools, churches, synagogues and industry, is a primary function of the intergroup relations center. Many times a social scientist is called in at the end of a campaign or after the distribution of an educational film to measure its success. Specialists point out that they can do little at this point. In a sense it is like erecting a building without scientific help and then calling in a construction engineer to test its strength. If social scientists are in at the beginning of an anti-prejudice drive, they can survey the situation—different types of prejudice require different techniques—and help to recommend the wisest courses for educational campaigning.

While the scientist is co-operating with the man who needs his help whether the person be a personnel manager, a film producer or a civic leader, he is accumulating valuable information for his own work. The social scientist gets nowhere building up hypotheses unless the hypotheses can be related to real situations in a community or factory. Work with an administrator yields rewarding opportunities for further study. In fact, a continuing and crucial need for the researcher is an assortment of questions and problems from actual experience. When he has an opportunity to examine and build techniques and check and recheck the results of a neighborhood project, he can add immeasurably to knowledge of intergroup relations.

#### IV. A TRAINING CENTER

---

THERE are always two sides to any personnel question. The manager wonders where he can find the person with the skills for a certain job. The hopeful applicant would like to know what kind of training he should have for the field he hopes to enter; what kind of early experience will help him to succeed in his chosen career. As a further indication of the lag between the social and physical sciences, we should note that training and experience are no problem at all for the physicist, chemist, engineer or doctor. Business administration, the law and various other fields have well-defined education and "internship" programs. But this is hardly true in many branches of the social sciences and particularly in the field of intergroup relations.

There are more than a thousand regional and national intergroup agencies that can use full-time intergroup relations experts. There are countless government agencies, labor unions, industrial plants, schools and research institutes in need of persons with skills in intergroup relations. Yet professional training and job preparation in this field is done in most cases on a hit-or-miss basis. The individual who wants to make intergroup relations his occupation

may find that this subject is not even touched upon in his psychology or sociology courses. The university or college that has a full-fledged anthropology department is rare. Many do not even offer courses in cultural anthropology.

This lack impedes the whole development of the field of human relations in a variety of ways. Research foundations or university centers, for example, can discover any number of "junior technicians," young graduates with skills in attitude testing and other rudimentary techniques learned in social science courses. But study directors who can launch and supervise a project of major proportions are rare indeed. The fact that teachers colleges omit information about America's multiple culture groups, as well as techniques for assimilating such groups into classroom life, makes it difficult for an intergroup-minded school superintendent to institute such education in his schools. Several industrial relations courses now include material on building teamwork across group boundaries, but thousands of personnel men face such situations in their plants with very meager knowledge about the different groups and how relations among individuals of varying cultures can be harmonized for more effective production.

The personnel need in intergroup relations is found to be on two levels: there is a demand for specialists who will make research or action in intergroup relations their full-time career, and there is a demand for practitioners who need human relations skills as part of their regular job. The practitioners include schoolteachers and educational administrators, government agency heads, clergymen, and anyone in any kind of supervisory capacity in

business or labor. A third level might very well be added which takes in all the citizens of any town or city, for civilization will require universal education in intergroup relations if peace in an atomic age is to be maintained. Some universities have already opened lectures and meetings on human relations subjects to the general public.

The university intergroup relations center, then, has as one of its chief responsibilities the training of personnel. Its staff of social scientists suit it for the work of training advanced research and action personnel. Its association with the community would permit it to place advanced students in "internships" in community agencies and industry. In this sense the intergroup relations center would serve not only the immediate community but the nation. After a two- or three-year course of study, the intergroup relations expert would be capable of bringing his knowledge and techniques to an area where no center exists, of directing the establishment of a center at another university, of co-ordinating the research or action program of a foundation, and of accomplishing countless other supervisory and advisory functions.

Requirements are exacting for the education of the advanced research director in intergroup relations. He needs to have the ordinary research skills plus the creative and administrative ability which will enable him to set up a research project and see it through. He needs to combine "many skills within one skull," to have knowledge in and respect for fields outside of his particular discipline. He must know what research is being done in intergroup relations in various fields and be able to use such data to

good advantage. He must see beyond the particular setting in which he is conducting research and allow for the limitations of that setting. Above all the training center must give to its advanced students the ability and the desire to relate research to practicalities—in the sense that they must be fully acquainted with the fields of the social engineer and practitioner—and to make his theories and findings (particularly by the avoidance of high-flown jargon) available to the average citizen.

The university center could aid the many individuals who need skills in intergroup relations in two ways. First it could present the future teacher, administrator or agency worker studying at the university with information and supervised community laboratory experience in intergroup relations. Secondly, it could open its doors to those who have never had such training but who hold responsible jobs in schools, community organizations, churches and industry and who need “refresher” courses or workshops in intergroup relations.

The establishment of courses in intergroup relations in undergraduate schools help to fill a specialized need. There should be more of them. But every teacher knows that sound information about intergroup teamwork (or its opposite—prejudice and misunderstandings) is learned at almost every hour of the day. Because it would co-ordinate the social science faculty in course planning, the center would help to insure the inclusion of such material in sociology, psychology, history, economics, geography and many other courses. Democratic institutions of learning can no longer afford to graduate men and women who

hold to prescientific myths about group differences and group behavior, or who lack insight and experience necessary to make them "fit to live with" in a society of many cultures.

A number of methods of training teachers and administrators in intergroup relations knowledge and skills on a part-time basis already have been developed. The university intergroup relations center would use these to good advantage. Evening lectures, seminars and workshops can accommodate men and women with daytime jobs. Better still as far as teachers are concerned is the summer workshop. For five years the National Conference of Christians and Jews, co-operating with a number of universities, has convened groups of teachers to work, discuss and learn in summer-long programs. These men and women, influential in the early training of thousands of school children, have been given information and techniques in this manner.

University centers might well adapt the resourceful combination of education and action, successfully carried out in Canada. Here, at one university, social scientists met with local community officials in a series of conference sessions to study the improvement of recreation planning. The officials returned to their work to carry out the many ideas and suggestions that they, as experts, had discussed with each other. Another Canadian university round-table meeting brought social scientists and high local government officials together to discuss means of formulating and executing social security programs.

The university center would be able to organize such conference sessions to consider particular community prob-

### *Intergroup Relations Centers*

lems. It could, for example, draw together industrial relations experts, labor officials and local personnel managers to discuss and outline plant education programs; or university educators, representatives from the local school system, parents and community organization people to discuss curriculum and extra-curricular intergroup education plans.

A new era is dawning in the nature and quality of the relationships of cultures. Colleges and universities must mobilize the resources of science, education and religion in training leadership for the new age.



## V. THE CENTER AS A COMMUNITY CLINIC

---

PERFECTLY healthy people now go every six months to cancer prevention clinics for check-ups. They know that cancer may go unnoticed and that the best chance for a cure, perhaps its only "cure," is early detection. Each year society loses much in goods and services as the result of disease and ill-health. And each year private and government agencies invest sizable sums in the cure and prevention of disease, knowing that such investment will bring good returns. Prejudice also costs money, billions of dollars a year. It is a blight that slows up and sometimes stops teamwork in economic enterprise. It is a blight that submerges large portions of our population, making them incapable of contributing their full worth to society, reducing their purchasing power, making them more susceptible to costly diseases, and subjecting them to an atmosphere that pushes up taxes for police and institutional care. The intergroup relations center would reach its full possibilities in the cure and prevention of social ailments that result from unnecessary group conflict and antagonism.

The functions of the center in ministering to the intergroup health of the community would be to diagnose, cure, and help to prevent all forms of tensions and crippling

conflicts. A center would diagnose the sore spots in intergroup relations in all segments of its local environment. It would not only describe the ailment, but administer therapy in the form of "packaged" educational programs for school, action agency or factory and by handling individual cases of discrimination in its "out-patient" clinic. Last but not least, the center would provide an informed statesmanship to put out smoldering sparks of conflict before they exploded into open unpleasantness and perhaps overt violence.

A few progressive communities have undertaken to study their own intergroup ailments. The Montclair, New Jersey, Audit is by now a famous instance of such community introspection. A frank appraisal of the amount of discrimination in a city or town can demonstrate the costliness of prejudice, as well as the "assets" that can improve intergroup co-operation. Assets, such as a housing project where different cultural and ethnic groups live as peaceful and co-operative neighbors, can be studied and used in the effort to wipe out the debit side of the ledger. Such audits resulted from the spontaneous enthusiasm of groups of citizens who thought it was wrong that Americans in their town could not get jobs because of their color, national background or religion, and who did not think it was democratic to forbid the use of hospitals to physicians and patients on similar un-American grounds. Their appraisals found favor with scientists interested in the development of accurate yardsticks to measure such situations and to develop techniques to correct them.

The intergroup relations center is intended to provide a means by which social scientists can answer such questions as: What kind of prejudice exists in a certain area? How did it develop? What has happened over a period of years to ease or aggravate it? Social scientists want replies to numerous other questions about human behavior. They know that new techniques to ease bad situations cannot be developed without considerably more information on what makes people think and act the way they do. How would a center help? First of all a center's social scientists would be in a much closer relationship with a town's problems than has previously been possible. Of course it is true that numerous scientific studies have been made on intergroup behavior. But many have had faults that a center would help to forestall. The scientists would be in at the beginning of many programs, so that they could not only diagnose the situation before a corrective project was begun, but could watch and check the usefulness of such measures. Attitude-testing at the end of a program would have far more meaning under these circumstances than it does when a scientist is called in to test results only at the end. Secondly, a center would have a continual opportunity to study situations that now go unnoticed. There have been instances, in cities with a considerable amount of intergroup hostility, of plants which have had little trouble, although not discriminating in any way. Here would be an ideal setting for an examination of policy, of workers' attitudes and the other aspects of such an encouraging situation. Social practitioners working in close proximity to a town or city would be in a position to spot trouble and

recommend therapy long before a situation reached the crisis or epidemic stage.

The intergroup relations center could be the medium through which factories, labor unions, neighborhood groups and schools obtained the latest and best in information about the groups in their midst and the techniques for smoothing out antagonisms and conflicts which threaten the well-being of the community. Social scientists and practitioners at the center could be considered the allies of leaders who want to see their community prosper and its citizens healthy and happy co-operators in the search for peace and prosperity.

There is much reading material now available for use by clubs, schools and industries. The center would advise on its selection and help to make additional material available. As it is now, many well-intentioned groups rely too much on "broadcast" material. A mayor's committee on group unity, for example, will put posters on display to call public attention to the harmful nature of prejudice and to plead for non-discrimination in factory, housing, schools and elsewhere. The disadvantages, or rather the shortcomings, of this method reveal the need for the close kind of co-operation between social science and community action that the intergroup relations center would supply.

"Broadcast" material, slogans, pamphlets, etc., aimed indiscriminately at all members of the community is most frequently used in anti-prejudice campaigns. Such effort has been labeled the heavy artillery that any kind of campaign needs. But it should only pave the way, as a soften-

ing-up operation, for pin-point attacks on more specific objectives by the "infantry." The broadcast attack by itself has liabilities. It may give rise to a false sense of security on the part of its planners. It may even become a substitute for action, since many who favor the continuation of various forms of prejudice will back activity that does not seem to involve definite change. Psychologists have pointed out that people with deep prejudices will dam up their hostility in the face of a campaign that sanctions lip service to intergroup democracy. Such a damming-up process may result in even greater release of tension at a later date, because the sick, prejudiced person has not really been cured of his ailment.

No widely sold commercial product relies on national or local advertising alone for its sales. Distributing agents are required to market the product locally. Such agents use advertisements to help sell the product to a dealer, but must back up advertising with a face-to-face sales talk. Similarly, poster and other broadcast methods combatting discrimination must be followed by specific action—a change in policy in an industry, programs in the local schools and churches, and neighborhood activities on the part of interested individuals.

The center could assist in those specific projects that aim to make the slogans of a poster campaign a community reality. It could provide professional guidance for various agencies. An industry or a labor union could conduct short-term educational courses supplied by the center for key workers or perhaps for all the members of the union local. A teacher or principal could seek advice about additions to

school curriculum or such entertainment as plays, pageants, or parties that will help youngsters to learn the true facts about the ethnic and religious groups which make up the world. Parent-Teacher's Associations, women's clubs and other neighborhood units have been increasingly aware in recent years that they must include members of all groups and work with them to achieve progress in all kinds of town projects. They could borrow speakers from the center, acquire reading material, films, slides and information about them, and, in general, seek help for various projects to improve intergroup democracy in the community.

There are times when something besides an educational program is needed to inform neighbors about each other and bring them together in an atmosphere of good will. Suppose, for example, that a youngster exhibits considerable prejudice in the classroom or play yard. A teacher might wish to find out how to deal with particular instances like this or perhaps a new situation created by the arrival of more members of a minority group in the community. A plant might be interested in handling specific problems that occur in one department as well as in a plant-wide educational program. In such a case the intergroup relations center's clinic would come into operation, diagnosing the trouble carefully and recommending the needed treatment.

The center's therapeutic measures need not necessarily be limited to its immediate environs. It would be practical to have the center service an entire region if its facilities could be enlarged to meet such a demand. Whole school systems could be served as well as the community groups

of many nearby towns who wanted the information and techniques which the center had to offer.

The best cure for a social illness is its prevention. Prejudices are learned. They can be unlearned, but much of such a slow and expensive process can be saved if prejudiced attitudes are never taught to children at all. Attitudes toward other culture and ethnic groups are formed in the school, at home, in the church and at play. True prevention must aim at all of these targets.

A therapeutic program aims to correct the wrongs that have already been committed. The preventive process involves the teaching of the facts, particularly in the school, about group differences, races, cultures, and their contrasting customs. This inevitably brings us back to the kind of education prospective teachers acquire in training colleges. If the teacher clings to the misconceptions about racial, religious and nationality prejudices transmitted uncritically by the social heritage, there is small chance that the youngster under his or her charge will ever learn the truth about the groups with which he must live. One aim of the intergroup relations center, as we have indicated, is to see that teachers get correct information in colleges or in post-graduate courses. The scarcity of textbook material containing the truth about human relations is another factor hindering the education of the next generation. A recent study by the American Council on Education \* revealed numerous instances where the truth was not told about America's varied groups in history books and even cases

\* *Intergroup Relations in Teaching Materials* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1949).

where errors were substituted for facts. The center could help to train teachers in workshop courses, and more than that could supply course material which is now lacking in many textbooks. Extra-curricular activities involving intergroup relations—plays, parties, the celebration of various holidays—are ways to build positive attitudes toward co-operation across group lines. Suggestions for such activity should also be available at the intergroup relations center.

Children learn attitudes by imitating their parents. In their early years youngsters have no reaction of fear or hatred to the physical characteristics that mark differences among groups. They learn such reactions from adults, for they are extremely sensitive to parental opinion about neighbors. Industry and community programs supplied by the intergroup relations center would be preventive in two ways: they would reach many parents and thus would help to make the home a bulwark against intergroup prejudice; they would improve the intergroup atmosphere of the community by sparing the child many of the scenes and events which sustain prejudiced attitudes.

We have attempted to outline the main functions of an intergroup relations center. The whole field has expanded tremendously in the last two or three decades. An increased interest on the part of social scientists in research has been accompanied by the desire of thoughtful citizens to build teamwork among all the groups in their cities and towns. The idea for the establishment of intergroup relations centers came from experiments which reflect this thriving determination, chiefly the various attempts by leading universities to meet the intergroup needs of com-



munities everywhere. Intergroup relations centers are not intended to supplant experimentation, research and education now being supervised by colleges and action agencies. Rather, they are meant to further all research and education in intergroup relations. It is assumed that research projects completed by centers will be made available for use by communities and research laboratories everywhere.

Recent developments in intergroup relations have highlighted some basic needs in intergroup research and education. Some of these were emphasized at the Princeton Conference sponsored by the Horowitz Foundation. These suggestions are offered here, first as they deal with the newly emerging field of intergroup relations in labor and industry, and secondly as they concern some basic needs in intergroup relations research. It is hoped that this material will not only be considered with regard to the proposed intergroup relations centers, but as possible fields for study and action by interested organizations everywhere.

## VI. INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN INDUSTRY

---

How are the men in a plant getting along, not only in their jobs but with their foremen and with each other? Employers are increasingly aware that they have a big stake in the answers to these questions. The idea that a factory is as much a segment of society as the home emerged from early industrial relations experiments. With this came the realization that a man spends most of his day at a job, and that many jobs in modern industry have various stifling effects on the individual. Plant managers are conscious of this fact and more and more aware of the importance of job interest to workers. They feel that their task is to see that workers know their real significance in the economy and the community.

A plant manager today is considered to be primarily concerned with human relations and not merely with materials and machinery. Many interesting lessons about the importance of human relations in industry came out of the war. Non-discrimination policies were specified by government order everywhere, necessitating in many cases the immediate solution of inter-racial and inter-religious problems. When old codes were breached with such decision, solution was perhaps made more difficult, but the problems

were in many cases met successfully. From this experience present-day scientists and practitioners at the proposed intergroup relations centers and elsewhere can learn much.

A program worked out by the War Manpower Commission was an amazing application of the new principles of human relations which have been uncovered by many specialists. What was the best way to make quick and willing workers, particularly when the bugaboo of prejudice might rear its head? The program had to find the answer.

To implement job-training, over a million foremen and supervisors in war industry were given short courses in how to treat their new co-workers. The basic idea was to make a worker feel his true importance in the plant. He was not dropped into his place on the assembly line without explanation. Nor was he expected to work blindly on some small part of a product. He was taken around the plant to see the final results of his work. He was given a chance to feel that he was participating in an important effort. A particular attempt was made to establish effective communications from management to worker, from worker to worker, and from worker back to management.

There is increasing awareness, in addition, that working hours, although they effect a man's attitudes to a considerable extent, occupy only a part of his day. What he does with the rest of his time, his part in the community, his home life, may have bearing on his effectiveness as a worker. A man constantly late to work may have a home problem too tough for him to solve. In many cases the application of scientific industrial relations policies helps

a worker to solve some trying situation in his home or community life. There is, of course, a danger that a man's privacy may be invaded by too great an interest in his off-hour occupations. To prevent this more than tact is needed. There should be actual limits, perhaps legal, on how far management and labor unions may intrude on an individual's privacy. There needs to be eternal watchfulness to prevent indirect coercion of any kind.

Intergroup relations in industry must be viewed as an intricate part of a whole problem. Discrimination hurts everyone. But discrimination is anything that prevents some individual or some group from making the best use of ability and talent. There may be religious prejudice operating, to the detriment of members of all groups, as well as considerable discrimination against women. In many cases a human relations problem begins with the worker himself. A worker dissatisfied with his job takes it out in aggression against some other group. Any program for better intergroup relations in industry must take all these factors into consideration.

As part of this total concept, employer and employee alike must realize their common role as members of an economic family. It may help to point out to workers that they discriminate against themselves when they refuse Negroes admission to their unions, but such an argument will not succeed until workers identify themselves as part of a group with common interests. The primary concern of union leadership, as of management, should be to establish such a common bond among all the people of the land.

Some such feeling of kinship among workers no doubt

already exists. During recent work on a community project, for example, it was found much more difficult to co-ordinate the various representatives of community organizations than to unite management and labor representatives of local industries. Tensions in plants will ease when common problems such as production and job security provide a common basis for united action. Getting the whole group adjusted as a group appears to be a better way of solving human relations problems than attacking sore spots head-on.

What in the specific area of better intergroup relations would make good programs for study and action in industry?

An intergroup relations inventory is as important as an inventory of equipment. That means that painstaking appraisals of actual intergroup attitudes and practices in various plants would add to the general store of information on industrial intergroup relations. It would help to account for the tensions and areas of discrimination and it would take into consideration the relation of the particular union or industry to neighboring communities. All tensions present in America will be reflected to some extent in an industry situation. Inventories would help to show the relationship between plant tensions and intergroup trends in the surrounding population territory.

The inventories might be made in industries with a satisfactory intergroup situation, similar to the ones the National Planning Association is now making of industrial plants with good labor-management relations. By underscoring the tensions and problems and the solutions worked

out over a period of time, application could be made to organized programs in other areas.

Such inventories might show the need for consultant services, available to large-scale industries and unions. The National Conference of Christians and Jews is offering courses, texts and attitude measurements to labor and management to promote education about group differences and the costs and causes of prejudice.\* Such a service could also help to adjust the ramified effects a large industry has on community life.

Any plan for an intergroup program in an individual company must take two primary factors into consideration. Wartime experience taught that the first essential of any program was for top management and top union leadership to adopt a firm policy of non-discrimination in hiring and upgrading of workers, to state it clearly and then to carry it out. It also proved that as little fuss as possible should be made about the introduction or upgrading of members of minority groups. It may be wise to tell workers in advance about changes in policy but advance polls about minority groups very often simply arouse resistance among workers.

Programs must consider these factors.

1. Much material exists in the field of intergroup relations that needs to be collected, sorted and applied to industry.

2. Widespread but rather dispersed efforts are now going on which must be conserved and put to more effective use. Industrial psychiatrists are being trained, for example,

\* See *A Handbook of Human Relations* by Everett R. Clinchy which will be published by Farrar, Straus and Company in the fall of 1949.

but unless there are going programs in industry which will make the best use of their talents, ability and training will go to waste.

3. It is necessary to know the best kind of techniques that are particularly fitted to industry. A good industry program will require considerable study of such methods and continual checking and re-checking as they are used.

4. America has had serious strikes over racial issues. The only way to prevent such costly outbreaks is to develop means of diagnosing their symptoms well in advance. It seems clear, as mentioned earlier in this essay, that the symptoms of the Detroit race riot of 1943 were apparent a year and a half before it took place.

5. Open and active communications is a vital key to satisfactory human relations in industry. Workers should be thoroughly familiar with management policy and at the same time be able to present their problems to the higher-ups with ease. There must also be good communications among the workers themselves, or there can scarcely be teamwork.

6. Today we have nation-wide industries and nation-wide unions. We find "absentee" management and labor leadership directing far-flung operations from a central point. In some ways this speeds up the implementation of company and union policies and could speed up an effective human relations program, but in other ways it creates difficulties. A company or union may adopt a non-discrimination policy but how this policy will be carried out in the widespread branches will depend on local leadership and local community problems.

7. As Dwight R. G. Palmer, president of General Cable Corporation points out, large industries have taken on the traits, power and influence of institutions. As institutions, both labor and management not only shape the sets of values, attitudes and behavior patterns of people, but they must accept responsibility for doing this with the security and future development of this free Republic in mind. *Guiding democratic intergroup relations* is one area in which all the institutions of a democracy must assert their leadership.

Increasing interest on the part of both management and labor is one encouraging signpost on the road to better relations among all groups in America. Where there were only a handful of education directors in unions a few years ago, there are eighty or more today. Such increasing awareness has led both management and labor to make provisions in their staffs and education programs for intergroup learning. Thus there are already pioneers for others to follow and program set-ups that may be studied and improved. All of this suggests ways in which centers of intergroup relations studies can serve American industry.



## VII. RESEARCH NEEDS IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS

---

A NUMBER of interesting studies, some of which can be outlined briefly, indicate the ways in which social science centers could add to knowledge of fundamental human behavior. These explorations fall into the category, in most cases, of "basic research," the kind of necessary study which urgently needs the support of conscientious American leaders in business and government.

A provocative theme for investigation would concern *spontaneity* and *equilibrium*. Spontaneity and equilibrium sound like terms a physicist might use to explain natural phenomena. Actually they are a social scientist's way of expressing a little understood human phenomenon. Study of the ways in which spontaneity and equilibrium affect actual intergroup situations would help to point up their significance for human relations policies in industry, school and community.

Analogies in natural science help to explain the terms. From the biologist's point of view a living organism is a pattern of energy. It takes energy in, distributes it within itself, and then expends it. If it takes in more energy than

it ordinarily uses, obviously something has to "happen." The organism must find use for it somehow. Animals have periodic tides or cycles of such energy. And so, it would seem, have human beings.

Destructive behavior on the part of human beings has hitherto been explained in two ways: either as instinctive and born into the individual, or as a response to some stimulus or frustration in the environment, past or present. If, however, there are "spontaneous" bursts of energy that have been observed in all living organisms, and that may become either destructive or constructive, the implications for all phases of human relations are vast.

It may be, for example, that for the maintenance of equilibrium, release of such energy through sports and other types of recreation and adventure should not only be considered desirable from the point of view of body-building and the relief of monotony, but they may be as essential as good health or nourishment. Applications of this theory of spontaneity and equilibrium to intergroup living and to international relations may foreshadow a considerable change in social thinking and statesmanship. The action problem in connection with this hypothesis would be to substitute for the destructive behavior activity that is personally satisfying as well as socially acceptable. It may imply that surplus energy can best be directed by group participation. A worker, for example, will disperse his spontaneous energy better if he has an interest in his job, if he feels that he is important and that what he is doing is related to all human endeavor.

Periodic gala occasions and special ways to use energy may prove to be as necessary for the rhythmic changes of pace in a dynamic peace as eating and sleeping. From Jeremiah's age when the Scythians "boiled over from the north" to the fanatical eruptions of Hitler's Nazi hordes, peoples have lost their equilibrium and gone on rampages. Can nobler and more constructive objectives be found which will channel the creative energy urges of nations and provide moral substitutes for war? Religious cultures and race groups have their periods of intake and expending. Is it conceivable that intergroup relations centers can work continuously and successfully to siphon off their extra energies for societally useful purposes and guard against all forms of group fanaticism and tyranny?

An all-discipline attack on the problem of spontaneity and equilibrium would be the best approach. It is primarily a biological and psychological phenomenon, but the use of such energy depends on cultural and social facts and thus it becomes an area for research by the sociologist and cultural anthropologist.

The relationship between *insecurity and tensions* is another item for basic research.

A basic and broad piece of research would study the connections between insecurities inherent in daily life and tensions among individuals and groups. When a difficult situation is ever present, it may engender deep feelings of insecurity within an individual. Such feelings result in further instability and greater and greater tensions.

People with broad, free-floating aggression caused by such insecurities are ready to fasten on prejudice and hates to release their pent-up aggression. Modern man looks out on a world that seems capricious to him. Industrialization and urbanization provide situations ripe for group animosities. Pavlov created "neuroses" in dogs by applying electric shocks in unpredictable and erratic ways, and by instituting feeding irregularities. The work of Pavlov, and later on of Gantt, shows that it was not the strength of the painful stimulus which caused frustration and conflict, but the confusion which resulted from trying to differentiate among the signals. It was the degree of conflict, resulting from indecision, which produced the behavior disorders.

Passing Fair Employment Practices Acts and other laws is one way to enforce sanctions against prejudice. They cannot, however, touch the insecurities which threaten people in many aspects of their daily lives. Deep psychological disturbances, the lack of ability to make decisions involving complex and contradictory stimuli in our culture pattern and the absence of motivation to change old intergroup habits, raise diagnostic and therapeutic questions far deeper than the areas a civil law can touch. Mental illnesses which reflect fears, prejudices and hates absorbed from infancy and ever after, call for individual and cultural studies. And if, as was claimed earlier in this book, those fears, prejudices and hates were culturally planted, the cultures which "carry" them must be changed.

The problems of insecurity and tensions, then, require

extensive work at centers where social scientists, educators and religious teachers can co-ordinate plans to solve them.

There is yet a third problem for observation. A group of workers sit down to discuss their intergroup problems. How can they resolve ethnic prejudice among members of their group? It is a fact that such prejudice hurts every one of them. It keeps workers apart and prevents them from collaborating smoothly in their trade union for mutual benefits. But then it is discovered that these workers of various nationalities, religious and color groups have little feeling of group solidarity as workers. Appealing to their self-interest on this basis, therefore, accomplishes little.

The same thing is true of other groups. There is the phenomenon of "five-o'clock anti-Semitism." A person works all day with a Jew. They get along very well and there is no cause for friction. And yet the same person assumes the role of anti-Semite at five o'clock when the taboos and patterns of club, social set and class status assert themselves. Business feelings of kinship with his Jewish fellow-worker do not transcend the traditions which prevail after working hours.

Consider other examples. A man has nine Negroes working for him, not because their labor is cheap, but, as he openly states, because they are the most reliable and the best workers he can find. And yet the same man takes part in a violent demonstration against Negroes, protesting their admission to a housing project. Again, Madison Square Garden could be packed with persons who avow that they are prejudiced against Negroes. But during a boxing match

in which a Negro fighter loses a very unfair decision to a white fighter, they would boo the referee out of the ring.

Such inconsistencies have implications for intergroup education techniques. While there is always a possibility that building solidarity across religious and ethnic lines may be accomplished by a transference of group feeling from one role to another, instances such as those cited above would indicate that one cannot be sure that such transference always takes place. It may mean that greater efforts should be expended in building up in-group solidarity in a broader fashion, integrating men in a plant, for instance, as a group of workers, before attacking the problem of intergroup conflicts. This is part of the problem all industrial plants face in promoting teamwork among employees, and, of course, part of the problem faced by schools and communities.

The deeper question for study here is: to what extent do individuals behave consistently toward members of other social groups? In modern industrial society, are there consistent and unified patterns of prejudice and discrimination? Or is discriminatory behavior highly variable in different situations?

Another question is: how much name-calling and prejudice are the result of group differences and how much simply aggression arising from the frustration caused by a myriad of other difficulties? The convenient labels offered by a culture pattern that sanctions prejudice may merely afford the aggressor an opportunity to release tension. Such a basic question as this would, of course, offer much data of value to scientists and practitioners. If there are

conflicts other than racial or religious ones giving impetus to hate movements, then attention should be directed toward such conflicts and toward the culture pattern that provides both the conflicts and the labels of prejudice. Assuming, as Professor Robert M. MacIver points out, that some ideas currently held about members of groups different from our own must be either partially or wholly revised, how can this be accomplished smoothly and without harmful repercussions? These are research questions with profound implications for theory and practice.

*Dilemma studies* belong on the list.

Studies similar to Myrdal's *An American Dilemma* are now considered to have rather serious limitations by many social scientists. They can contribute to the solution of a minority problem, but should not be embraced as panaceas. They are necessary aids which can highlight other intergroup problems in America, but they are by no means sufficient in themselves.

The publication of *An American Dilemma* had many repercussions. It raised the general level of discussion, although it contained little new material on Negro-white relations. Perhaps its greatest value was in revitalizing and redefining this issue. It also had the effect of making action on the problem somewhat more respectable than it had been. Studies of other groups in the United States could have similar beneficial results.

The ultimate aim of intergroup relations programs is not merely to promote peace among groups in the United States, but to help to preserve the peace abroad. One major

factor in this effort is the influence of intergroup relations in America on our relations with other countries. At meetings of nations, United States policies toward minority groups are frequently criticized. A study of the continuing effect of intergroup relations on the status of this country abroad would be valuable from a historical point of view and perhaps in arousing interest in the improvement of intergroup relations. A study might cover, for example, the connections between our policy toward the Chinese, particularly in California, and Far Eastern affairs. Our relations with Japan in prewar years were severely strained by our domestic policies. Japanese who were and now are friendly to the United States say that American injustices were a definite factor in starting the war with the West. The shore lines of the United States have become its show windows, and this fact must be considered as we attempt to improve our human relations attitudes and patterns.



### VIII. THE UNIVERSITY, THE INVESTOR AND THE INTERGROUP RELATIONS CENTER

---

SUPPOSE that a sure cure for cancer remained locked in someone's laboratory. Nearly 200,000 people died of cancer last year in the United States alone, many more were bedridden, unable to contribute their full worth to society, unable to enjoy a free and happy life. Suppose that the cure was not made available because no money could be found to process it, because people in a position to support its production and distribution showed a complete lack of interest. If a cure for such a debilitating and fatal disease were lost in this manner, it would seem shocking, wasteful and stupid in scientific, twentieth-century America.

The chances of this happening are, of course, slim. Scientific discoveries about disease, and physical knowledge generally, are welcomed by practitioner and public alike. The ways and means of putting them to use are, in most cases, speedily furnished.

To say that the "sure cure" for human relations problems lies locked in a social science laboratory would be an exaggeration. But it is accurate to say that individuals and

foundations have failed conspicuously in supporting the scientific social studies and educational therapy which alone can determine whether newly developed forms of physical energy will be used for good or evil. To continue an investment philosophy that leaves human relations studies, training and educational programs impoverished would be as dangerous and foolish as to have neglected the advance of the physical sciences.

In a sense we *are* keeping solutions to intergroup relations problems "locked up." The written works of social scientists who devote their lives to this field are not fully used and some gather dust on library shelves. Many important studies are hampered for lack of funds. Hard-working community leaders struggle valiantly, with inadequate means and information, to win the perennial battle for peace and prosperity in their cities and towns. Social scientists and far-seeing educators, statesmen, churchmen, leaders in labor and industry, have helped to lay the foundation for the resolution of intergroup conflicts. On this foundation the structures must be built which will ensure democratic living for all Americans, and for all the world the peace and security promised by a technological age. The social scientists and educators need and deserve the money and the help for their work to the same generous extent that Americans have invested in the physical sciences.

Universities and their communities are linked in many ways. University-trained men and women become policy-making business leaders and statesmen, teachers that help to guide the thinking and the morality of future citizens,

technicians who put new forms of energy at the disposal of the nation. University scholars prepare an atom bomb for wartime use, advise on government foreign policy, write the important books that help to change the course of history. The time has come for the university to chart a new course in the all-important field of intergroup relations.

The uranium "dice," with which this book opened, are a symbol of the overwhelming power of physical knowledge. Thoughtful citizens who live in the shadows of the cities around every university do not want the turn of the dice left to chance. They want reason and enlightenment to control for human good the new powers physical science has bestowed. An increasing body of citizens is beginning to realize that the social scientists, the educators and the philosophers can overcome the cultural lag behind material progress. Citizens expect America's universities to do this job. A bold plan is needed. First, the social scientists and educators must be mobilized to focus their research and teaching on our pressing intergroup problems. A second and equally important need is for universities to distribute cultural and intercultural knowledge and techniques to the practitioners in their communities, through the channels of the school, church, civic organizations, industry and the mass mediums of press, radio, theater.

The idea and plan of the intergroup relations centers for which this book pleads emerged in universities. It can be organized, financed and operated as medical centers now are promoted. As individuals, and local foundations appreciate the need, they will give ever increasing help and support to the development. We do not need to think

strictly in terms of the large university center which this book visualizes. Beginnings can be made in many small ways by colleges and community groups. If they bear in mind the chief needs in intergroup relations: co-ordination of research and action efforts, the usefulness of proper training for skilled and "semi-skilled" workers, the need for teaching methods that will develop skills and competencies in intergroup living, much good can be accomplished, even if it begins on a shoestring.

As the intergroup relations centers prosper, more young scientists will turn their interests and talents toward them. As the university centers serve the community, they will grow in enrollments, professorships, endowments, and influence.

By this policy of the conservation of human resources in every culture, universities and communities will truly be making the best use of a democratic freedom in which the advancement of social science is encouraged, and which alone assures that the findings of physical science (which no one should wish curtailed) will be used to promote the best in the good life for all.





Intergroup relations centers. main  
301.153C641i C.2



3 1262 03208 2538

301.153  
C641i  
C.2

Withdrawn from UF. Surveyed to Internet Archive

